

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

June 4, 2003

CALL TO ORDER:

Chairman Bob Barnard called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Beaverton City Hall Council Chambers at 4755 SW Griffith Drive.

ROLL CALL:

Present were Chairman Bob Barnard, Planning Commissioners Eric Johansen, Dan Maks, Shannon Pogue, Vlad Voytilla, and Scott Winter. Planning Commissioner Gary Bliss was excused.

Planning Services Principal Hal Bergsma, Consultant Patrick Sweeney, Assistant City Attorney Ted Naemura, and Recording Secretary Sandra Pearson represented staff.

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Barnard, who presented the format for the meeting.

VISITORS:

Chairman Barnard asked if there were any visitors in the audience wishing to address the Commission on any non-agenda issue or item. There were none.

STAFF COMMUNICATION:

Planning Services Principal Hal Bergsma briefly discussed issues with regard to the Bethany area, observing that these Urban Growth Boundary additions have been found in compliance with Statewide Planning Goals by the State Land Conservation and Development Commission. He pointed out that there has been some discussion with regard to the City of Beaverton's role in concept planning for that area which must be completed before urban zoning can be applied. He explained that if the City of Beaverton is to take responsibility for concept planning, area owners and residents would first have to commit to annexation for this area that encompasses approximately 720 acres.

1 **WORK SESSIONS:**

2
3 **I. 114TH AVENUE AREA REDEVELOPMENT PLAN**
4 **PROJECT**

5 In late 2001, the City received a \$45,000 grant from the State
6 Transportation and Growth Management (TGM) Program to
7 prepare a redevelopment plan for a part of the Beaverton Down-
8 town Regional Center along Canyon Road, south of Center
9 Street and west of Highway 217. This area encompasses
10 approximately 29 acres, is bisected by the Westside MAX Light
11 Rail line, and is one of the key gateway locations to the Down-
12 town area. The work session will include a presentation on the
13 project by City staff and the project consultants that will
14 describe the planning process and the draft plan resulting from
15 this process. This presentation is intended to provide the Com-
16 mission with context for a Comprehensive Plan Amendment and
17 a Development Code Text Amendment proposed to implement
18 the draft plan that are scheduled for a hearing on June 18, 2003.
19

20 Mr. Bergsma described the 114th Avenue Area Redevelopment Plan
21 Project, which involves an effort at providing more pedestrian friendly
22 development in this area. He explained that the City had applied for a
23 Transportation Growth Management Grant, adding that the packet
24 provides information with regard to the proposed scope of work
25 involved in this project. Noting that the goal is to provide for greater
26 density, more compact and pedestrian friendly mixed-use development,
27 he pointed out that this generally pertains to the downtown Beaverton
28 area. He discussed positive features of the area, including great
29 visibility for retail and office uses, as well as good access via freeway,
30 Canyon Road, and the Beaverton Transit Center. He mentioned that
31 there is a good potential for mixed-use, including a higher density
32 residential potential north of Hall Creek.
33

34 Consultant Patrick Sweeney explained that the project makes sense
35 with regard to future residential development and provided
36 illustrations indicating that the greenway provides a great amenity for
37 any future residential development. Observing that Highway 217
38 creates both an opportunity and a barrier, he discussed the best
39 locations for access into the site.
40

41 Mr. Bergsma provided color illustrations depicting views of the subject
42 site along SW Canyon Road and described the process created by the
43 TGM Contract Agreement and discussed Tasks 1 through 7, adding
44 that the hearings on Comprehensive Plan and Development Code text

1 amendments to implement the plan proposed for the area should occur
2 by June 30, 2003. He discussed alternatives and issues related to the
3 project, observing that the consultant team and City planners met with
4 local developers to create plans that would be responsive to the
5 regional market.

6
7 Mr. Sweeney discussed recommendations and findings for successful
8 redevelopment, adding that people would have to be attracted to the
9 site. He observed that ground floor retail is a viable option for this site
10 and that both public sector and private sector leadership are vital in
11 the success of this project.

12
13 Mr. Bergsma described the final three alternatives considered,
14 including Concept "D" (least density), Concept "E", and Concept "F"
15 (greatest density).

16
17 Mr. Sweeney explained that the difference between Concept "D" and
18 Concept "F" involves the north/south connection.

19
20 Mr. Bergsma discussed the connection, specifically the issue with
21 connecting SW 114th Avenue to SW 115th Avenue, which provides the
22 City with a north/south connection as included in the TSP, improves
23 circulation and access in the project study area. He explained that this
24 is viewed by the developers as one of the key factors to making the
25 land prime for redevelopment, adding that construction of the
26 north/south connection would require acquiring private land and
27 reimbursing and/or relocating affected property and business owners.
28 He noted that the east/west connection, although shown in the City's
29 TSP, has been removed from consideration during this project due to
30 insufficient traffic demand for this route and additional public costs for
31 implementation.

32
33 Mr. Bergsma discussed the potential impact on *Carr Subaru*, observing
34 that this automobile dealership is the largest business in the area,
35 adding that they are concerned with the possibility of a disruption to
36 their existing business and/or reducing the size of their operations. He
37 explained that other issues include the possible relocation of *Valley*
38 *Garbage*, emphasizing that in addition to problems with locating a
39 potential site for relocation, they don't want to move. He discussed the
40 multiple property owners and their differing objectives, as well as the
41 cost of structured parking and Light Rail access, observing that it
42 might become necessary to either provide a new station or improve
43 access to the existing Beaverton Transit Center Station.

44

1 Mr. Bergsma discussed the various features of preferred alternative
2 Concept "F" and the public investment in road infrastructure. Observ-
3 ing that staff has provided some rough estimates of the potential
4 resulting investment on improvements by the public, he mentioned
5 that that the high end is \$6 million, while the cost to the private sector
6 would be an estimated \$80 to \$100 million. He discussed strategies for
7 implementation and potential funding sources, including City funds,
8 Local Improvement Districts, an MTIP Grant, Metro TOD Program,
9 TOD Property Tax Abatement Program, Vertical Mixed-Use Tax
10 Abatement Program, Business Energy Tax Credits, Federal Transit
11 Administration (FTA) funding, and Economic Improvement District.

12
13 Mr. Bergsma discussed Marketing Strategies, including public,
14 private, and public/private. He explained the Steps to Completion, as
15 follows: 1) Eliminate Risk and Uncertainty; 2) Public plus City
16 Partnership; and 3) Land Development. He introduced Project
17 Coordinator Jennifer Polley, emphasizing that she would be involved
18 in the next steps in the process.

19
20 Mr. Sweeney discussed the three Steps to Completion, including
21 analysis of the site and determination of problems through to what he
22 referred to as "Catalyst 1" – the public hearing process, observing that
23 this process kicks in the public/private partnership.

24
25 Mr. Bergsma offered to respond to questions and comments.

26
27 Commissioner Johansen discussed tools for development concept,
28 emphasizing that tax abatement not currently available.

29
30 Mr. Bergsma pointed out that while it is possible to establish tax
31 abatement districts, it is not yet the time. He also noted that the char-
32 ter basically restricts the ability to establish urban renewal districts.

33
34 Commissioner Maks requested clarification with regard to what staff is
35 requesting the Planning Commission to adopt.

36
37 Mr. Bergsma explained that the Planning Commission would be
38 considering two applications on June 18, 2003, adding that these
39 applications involve changes to permitted uses, conditional uses,
40 development standards, and the major pedestrian route map.

41
42 Observing that he is appreciative of the work and process involved,
43 Commissioner Maks questioned how many property owners and
44 buildings would be non-conforming. Noting that he anticipates

1 numerous challenges, he requested clarification of the term “marginal
2 businesses”.

3

4 Mr. Bergsma discussed the ratio between property improvements and
5 land values in this area, adding that a marginal business generally has
6 a low improvement value relative to land value.

7

8 Commissioner Maks pointed out that if these businesses are actually
9 serving a need of the citizens he is concerned with where they would
10 locate and/or where the citizens would go to get these needs met. He
11 pointed out that he has been watching the City of Vancouver develop
12 for 25 years, adding that their challenges are nothing like the
13 challenges facing the City of Beaverton.

14

15 Concurring that the City of Beaverton would encounter many
16 challenges, Chairman Barnard expressed his opinion that this project
17 is very exciting, adding that it is necessary to take the initiative and
18 that he is interested in seeing how those challenges are met.

19

20 Mr. Bergsma mentioned that staff is proposing a change to the purpose
21 statement of the Regional Center-East (RC-E) zoning district, adding
22 that this would establish the context and is a good place to start.

23

24 Chairman Barnard pointed that although it did take the City of
25 Vancouver 25 years to develop, if they had not started 25 years ago,
26 they would not be done today.

27

28 Commissioner Maks expressed concern with the effect that increased
29 density would have on travel, noting that the traffic on SW Canyon
30 Road would eventually travel at a speed of seven miles per hour.

31

32 Mr. Bergsma agreed that it is anticipated that increased density would
33 result in increased traffic.

34

35 Commissioner Maks noted that Office/Commercial generates the
36 greatest amount of traffic, observing that due to the automobile
37 oriented retail uses, the automobiles are already there. He pointed out
38 that while it is not possible to eliminate parking, it is possible to
39 increase the number of trips by alternative methods of transportation.

40

41 Mr. Sweeney agreed that the site is a challenge, emphasizing that the
42 parcelized ownership on the site creates issues, which is why this
43 property has not been developed already.

44

1 Commissioner Maks emphasized that he wants to make certain not to
2 damage existing uses, businesses, or the City of Beaverton in the
3 process, adding that development may take longer due to numerous
4 impediments.

5
6 Mr. Sweeney expressed his opinion that the most important issue is
7 the overall vision of what this area could become.

8
9 Commissioner Voytilla stated that he is torn between the comments of
10 Commissioners Barnard and Maks, adding that while he is glad to see
11 the plan and feels the vision is appropriate, it does not appear to be
12 completely thawed, adding that many issues need immediate answers.

13
14 Mr. Bergsma pointed out that staff had considered properties with
15 orientation to both SW Canyon Road and SW 114th Avenue, adding
16 that they had focused on the Gateway location.

17
18 Mr. Voytilla mentioned that one of the assets listed is the Arts and
19 Communication School, emphasizing that his request to have this
20 campus included before received no response. He pointed out that he
21 is concerned with the road projected to the Center Street Driveway,
22 observing that there would be no ability to change this non-permitted
23 use.

24
25 Mr. Bergsma explained that this falls outside the boundary of the
26 regional center, adding that while it involves a major amenity with a
27 potential relation to this area, staff felt, when defining the study area
28 staff felt that there was limited redevelopment potential.

29
30 Commissioner Voytilla mentioned that other groups are interested in
31 redevelopment of this asset, emphasizing that a public support for the
32 arts has been identified. He explained that Center Street does not
33 make a good boundary, adding that the campus was there prior to any
34 of these other facilities. He pointed out that there is also a problem
35 created by the street moving east and jutting at a 90 degree turn to the
36 north, adding that both sides of the intersection includes two
37 significant public utility facilities, creating more traffic issues that
38 need to be resolved. He expressed his opinion that this is greater than
39 a minor issue such as a driveway alignment, adding that he sees small
40 entrepreneurs, rather than major retail locating in the area.

41
42 Mr. Bergsma noted that the focus of the project is on the south end and
43 that owners in the north end of the area – mostly single family homes
44 and apartment complexes – did show as much interest in this project.

Commissioner Voytilla mentioned the proposed 40,000 square feet of retail and structured parking, adding that it is a tough site to make attractive.

Mr. Bergsma concurred that the site is challenging.

Observing that the opportunity is available, Commissioner Voytilla expressed his opinion that the Light Rail Station should be included in the plan, emphasizing the necessity of strengthening the connection. He pointed out that he is concerned with the potential displacement of existing uses, and questioned whether staff has considered other options.

Mr. Bergsma advised Commissioner Voytilla that staff has considered and supports the option of relocating *Valley Garbage*.

Commissioner Voytilla expressed his concern with utilities, potential impacts, storm drainage, retention, and water quality issues.

Mr. Bergsma assured Commissioner Voytilla that these issues had been considered and reviewed by staff.

Emphasizing that the proposal involves a huge component involving a great deal of impervious surface, Commissioner Voytilla pointed out that a large area would be needed to provide adequate water quality.

Mr. Sweeney suggested increasing the buffer of Hall Creek, observing that it would be possible to incorporate storm water facilities into that buffer area.

8:17 p.m. through 8:30 p.m. – recess.

II. APPLICATION OF SMART DEVELOPMENT PRINCIPLES AND GOALS IN BEAVERTON

The State Transportation and Growth Management (TGM) Program is seeking input from Planning Commissions throughout the State with regard to how well “smart development” techniques work with the specific conditions of various local governments, including Beaverton. Portland State University, along with the University of Oregon, has developed materials to facilitate a discussion on this issue. Steve Johnson of PSU will guide the discussion, with the goal of learning from the Planning Commission with regard to implementation of smart development practices in the city, as well as assistance that can be provided

1 to local jurisdictions by the TGM program. The Planning Com-
2 mission's comments will be recorded, summarized and provided
3 to the staff of the two State agencies responsible for admini-
4 stering the TGM Program, specifically the Oregon Department
5 of Transportation and the Department of Land Conservation
6 and Development. The discussion will begin with a brief
7 overview of the TGM program and smart development practices.

8
9 **STEVE JOHNSON**, representing *Portland State University (PSU)*,
10 explained that the goal of this program to go out into 26 separate
11 communities throughout the State of Oregon and compile information
12 in an attempt to understand how the different entities are dealing with
13 land use and transportation issues. Observing that smart
14 development and smart growth are closely related, he explained that
15 this Work Session involves a short presentation with regard to the
16 State of Oregon's Transportation and Growth Management Program.
17 He pointed out that this session provides an opportunity to obtain
18 information on how the City of Beaverton addresses these issues while
19 allowing the students to become involved.

20
21 **DARREN MULDOON** introduced himself as an urban planning
22 student at Portland State University.

23
24 **EVAN MacKENZIE** mentioned that he is also an urban planning
25 student at Portland State University, adding that he would be
26 graduating the following week. He explained that the goal with this
27 project is to determine choices that may or may not be available in
28 some communities, emphasizing that people should not be limited or
29 constrained in their choices. He pointed out that the goal is also to
30 provide more transportation choices, not less; vibrant cities, suburbs
31 and towns; and a wider variety of housing choices; adding that well-
32 planned growth serves to improve the quality of life. Observing that
33 families care about how communities grow, he noted that there is
34 concern with increasing traffic and longer commutes.

35
36 Mr. MacKenzie discussed people's concerns with the environment,
37 economics, equity, and engagement and/or involvement in their
38 children and civic activities. He addressed the issue of sprawling
39 development, including the pressure to develop farmland, changing
40 demographics, safety concerns, congestion, health concerns, lack of
41 civic spaces, and poor street connectivity. He pointed out that
42 sprawling development increases the cost of public infrastructure,
43 which is passed on to home purchasers. Noting that changing

1 demographics have created new transportation and housing demands,
2 he mentioned that pedestrian safety concerns must be addressed.

3
4 Mr. MacKenzie explained that increasing congestion have created
5 increased health costs related to noise, air and water pollution, adding
6 that places are oriented around the automobile rather than those who
7 use them. He mentioned the lack of street connectivity, adding that
8 curvilinear streets encourage both speeding and congestion. He point-
9 ed out how interconnected streets offer more route choices and encour-
10 age walking and bicycling, emphasizing that suburban mothers spend
11 17 full days a year behind the wheel – more than the average parent
12 spends dressing, bathing, and feeding a child. Observing that more
13 time spent traveling leaves less time for what you want to do, and
14 suggested that mixed uses vertically integrated can create multiple
15 transportation choices, walkable streets and neighborhoods, buildings
16 oriented toward people, centrally located public spaces, and fiscally
17 responsible growth. He explained that this includes a mix of uses with
18 residential, office and retail facilities in close proximity to each other.

19
20 Observing that these principles apply in existing towns as well as new
21 developments, Mr. MacKenzie illustrated how a network of pedestrian
22 and bicycle paths encourage alternatives to driving. He noted that
23 clustering and mixed use and higher intensity land uses support
24 efficient transit use and more walking. He explained that buildings
25 oriented toward the street encourage pedestrian activity, adding that
26 this also provides centrally located squares and parks, which creates
27 an attractive neighborhood. He mentioned that the cost of shared
28 infrastructure is less for roads, utilities and schools, urging the
29 Planning Commissioners to support this concept by rewriting the code
30 to support well-designed development.

31
32 Mr. MacKenzie suggested that staff conduct community visioning exer-
33 cises, initiate neighborhood planning, and create coalitions that in-
34 clude entire community. He discussed revitalization of the main
35 street, pointing out that improvements such as the addition of awnings
36 and trees attracts people. He described the various tools of mixed use
37 development, including skinny streets, street-front commercial, side-
38 walks and street trees, street fixtures, traffic calming, awnings, out-
39 door seating, and pedestrian bulb-outs. He provided illustrations de-
40 picting examples of redeveloped areas throughout the State of Oregon.

41
42 Mr. Johnson discussed the main issues in the City of Beaverton relat-
43 ing to transportation and land use, requesting clarification of what the
44 Planning Commissioners consider to be the three toughest issues.

1 Commissioner Johansen discussed the illustration describing what
2 smart growth is and is not, as follows:

- 3
- 4 1. More transportation choices and less traffic, NOT against cars
5 and roads;
 - 6 2. Vibrant cities, suburbs, and towns, NOT anti-suburban;
 - 7 3. Wider variety of housing choices, NOT about telling people
8 where or how to live; and
 - 9 4. Well-planned growth that improves quality of life, NOT against
10 growth.
- 11

12 Mr. Johansen pointed out that the reference to suburban is
13 inflammatory, expressing his opinion that it is indicative of a bias in
14 the discussion. Referring to housing options, he noted that higher
15 density and smaller lots have become necessary, adding that smart
16 growth is not encouraging variety as much as trying to direct.

17

18 Commissioner Maks expressed his approval of what he referred to as a
19 great presentation, noting that just because you add a lane does not
20 mean someone goes out and purchases a car. He explained that he
21 agrees with mixed use and what has been said, but only for a
22 significant minor portion of development within this community.
23 Observing that he has heard from the citizens, he pointed out that any
24 commercial use next to residential use requires HVAC equipment that
25 is completely enclosed. He pointed out that development next to any
26 conflicting zone would require a much greater level of review.
27 Reiterating that he believes in what was said, he explained that he
28 would like to implement it in certain places in certain ways. He
29 explained that he has no problem with cul-de-sacs, adding that it is
30 possible to develop subdivisions that people want to live in on a cul-de-
31 sac, although it might be necessary to drive further out of the way to
32 get where you are going through a major collector.

33

34 Mr. Bergsma discussed issues with regard to the Bethany Urban
35 Growth Boundary Addition, including Metro's goals and what should
36 be applied within that area.

37

38 Chairman Barnard discussed the effort to create all these communities
39 where you can walk, work, fish, golf, and shop, adding that he does not
40 intend to walk to do any of these things. He pointed out that he has
41 noticed that those who ride the bus to shop only do so because they
42 have no choice, emphasizing that it is neither realistic nor intelligent
43 to believe that people are going to do all this walking or ride public
44 transit.

1 Commissioner Maks agreed that Chairman Barnard is correct to a
2 certain degree, adding that shopping choices depend largely upon
3 economics.

4
5 Commissioner Johansen expressed his opinion that while Washington
6 County is incredibly limited with regard to transportation, the City of
7 Portland is creating nice little amenities such as the streetcar. He
8 pointed out that there is an incredible amount of public subsidy in the
9 form of tax abatements and urban renewal.

10
11 9:17 p.m. – Assistant City Attorney Ted Naemura left.

12
13 Commissioner Voytilla noted that while it would be wonderful to live
14 in a neighborhood that also provides your shopping, schools, and
15 recreational opportunities within walking distance, most individuals
16 change jobs up to eight times in a professional career. He expressed
17 his opinion that it is necessary to consider the reality of how people
18 live, including the concept of dual income households. He mentioned
19 that another aspect involves all of the activities people are involved in
20 beyond their work, leaving very little time for public transit.

21
22 Commissioner Maks noted that a seven-minute drive from his home to
23 downtown Beaverton equals a one hour and ten minute bus ride.

24
25 Commissioner Voytilla agreed that public transit not always
26 convenient with regard to different lifestyles that families are involved
27 in. Observing that there has been enough analysis and that policies
28 have been created, he emphasized that the greatest need involves
29 funding. He pointed out that it has been estimated that \$3 Billion is
30 necessary just to accommodate the City's existing transportation
31 system improvement needs.

32
33 **MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS:**

34
35 The meeting adjourned at 9:30 p.m.